



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/713,102	11/17/2003	Masafumi Kawase	S-2500/CONT	9782
62479	7590	09/25/2006	EXAMINER	
HAHN & VOIGHT PLLC 1012 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 620 WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MOORE, MARGARET G	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		1712		

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/713,102	KAWASE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Margaret G. Moore	1712	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 July 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 13 to 16, 18 to 24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 16 and 18 to 24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 13 to 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 16 and 18 to 24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 1712

1. Claims 16 and 18 - 24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim can depend upon other claims in the alternative only (for claim 16) and cannot depend upon other multiply dependent claims (for claims 18 to 24). See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 16 and 18 to 24 have not been further treated on the merits.

2. Claims 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear from the language as found in amended claim 13 what monomers (A) and (B) are. It would appear, for instance, that 3-methacryloxypropyltrimethylsilane is (A) but the use of "and/or" before the next two silanes, in addition to the presence of "(B)" afterwards makes it unclear what constitutes (A) and what constitutes (B).

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Tsutsumi et al.

This rejection relies on the rationale noted in the previous office action. Applicants' traversal is not persuasive. It is argued that a new method is claimed – a method for imparting flow and leveling properties to water base coating. Applicants note that the prior art fails to teach imparting flow and leveling properties.

This argument is not persuasive because "for imparting flow and leveling properties" is a preamble. If the body of a claim fully and intrinsically sets forth all of the limitations of the claimed invention, and the preamble merely states, for example, the purpose or intended use of the invention, rather than any distinct definition of any of the claimed invention's limitations, then the preamble is not considered a limitation and is of no significance to claim construction. In the instant application, the claim sets forth all of the limitations of the invention in that the claim is drawn to a method and the only step

Art Unit: 1712

required by this method is the step of "adding". The preamble is of no significance to the claim construction. The prior art must merely meet the method step of "adding" to meet the claims.

With this in mind, note that the claim *contains* a product by process limitation. In the previous office action the Examiner did not mean that the claim is a product by process claim. The claim is not product by process per se, but does contain such a limitation in that the trimethylsilyl polymer that is added to the water base coating is defined in a product by process manner. The Examiner maintains that the products per se appear to be the same, although prepared in a different manner.

Thus, the "adding" found in the method of Tsutsumi et al. meets the claimed adding step. The preamble limitation does not appear to provide any patentability to the fully defined method claim. The products which are added appear to be inherently the same, albeit prepared by a different manner. In this manner the rejection of claim 14 is maintained.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Margaret G. Moore whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 1712

272-1090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday and Friday, 10am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571) 272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Margaret G. Moore
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1712

mgm
9/20/06